



Inscriptions East and West in the First Millennium: The Common Heritage and the Parting of the Ways

Author(s): IHOR ŠEVČENKO

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 1998, Vol. 22, Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe (1998), pp. 527-537

Published by: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41036756>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*

Inscriptions East and West in the First Millennium: The Common Heritage and the Parting of the Ways

IHOR ŠEVČENKO

At some point in their careers most historians of Ukraine have to face the identity question expressed by the formula “East and West.” It is in the nature of things that these historians deal mostly with East-Central and Eastern Europe, and with the second millennium of our era. It is worth recalling, however, that in Christian civilization dichotomies and transitions involving East and West occurred on territories extending from Spain to eastern Asia Minor and the Caucasus. These dichotomies and transitions were taking shape in the first millennium. I hope that Professor Roman Szporluk, who is among the prominent historians of modern Ukraine and who, as a practitioner of the comparative method, likes to search for the roots of things, will find the present offering to be of some interest.

I

In this broad outline I will deal with Christian inscriptions in Latin and Greek that for the most part come from the territory of what was, or had been, the Roman Empire, and which, roughly speaking, were produced during the first thousand years of our era.¹ A commonsensical assumption underlies the outline’s subtitle: in their form and content, epigraphical documents, like other manifestations of written culture, reflected the evolution of social structures and cultural settings, and the changes within institutions and social groups that produced them.

With respect to early Christian and early medieval epigraphy, one could expect *a priori* to find numerous common traits, at least initially, irrespective of the geographical location of the evidence and the language in which it has been transmitted. The persistence of these common traits was made possible, in the first place, by the unity of the Empire in the first four centuries of our era—a unity that had as its consequence much administrative and cultural uniformity. Such uniformity on the imperial scale also created preconditions for the free movement of people who carried their cultural, and therefore their epigraphical, habits from one end of the Mediterranean world to the other. This freedom of movement is illustrated by the fourth-century tombstone of a (perhaps Jewish) wine merchant who hailed from Alexandria in Egypt, but died in Tomis, which is Constanța in modern Romania.² These common traits were also due to the close ideological bonds that held the producers of Christian

inscriptions together. These bonds transcended, if only on a superficial level, the multilingualism of the early Christian culture. In the case of Greek and Latin, this led to graphic and terminological hybrids, reflecting cultural interpenetration, especially among the lower layers of Christian society. An inscription in Latin thus would be written in Greek letters;³ or a tomb with enough room for two bodies would be called *visomus* in a Latin inscription from fourth-century Rome (from the Latin *bis*, “twice,” and the Greek *sōma*, “body”),⁴ while on the other hand, dozens of tombs in the late antique Greek East were called *mnēmorion* (cf. the Latin *memoria*).

Between the end of the fourth and the end of the fifth century, the political unity of the Empire was first weakened and then made to collapse altogether, at least in the West. The bond of multilingualism began to yield to divisive monolingualism both East and West, with, on the Western side, a vestigial prestige of the Greek leading to the epigraphical use of the Greek alphabet and distorted Greek words by Latin show-offs ignorant of the Greek language (illustrative examples come from seventh- to eighth-century Milan).⁵ This was the reverse of the earlier state of things, when the Greek alphabet was used in inscriptions by commissioners or stonecutters of Greek culture to write in Latin, of which they had only a superficial knowledge.⁶

In time, the cultural bonds within Christianity loosened as well. Newcomers to the Mediterranean civilization, such as the Lombards, while absorbing, with mixed results, the standards of Latin high culture that they found in the conquered territories, brought in values of their own. Again, one would expect a priori that this linguistic, political, and cultural drifting apart would find its reflection in epigraphy.

II

These general considerations are still to be validated by scholars in full detail. In the meantime, some preliminary spot checks, made to a large extent with the help of evidence coming from Italy and the area south of the Danube (more precisely, present-day Romania), will provide material for such validation.

Throughout the Empire, early Christian sarcophagi exhibited traits inherited from pagan times. Tools of trade were displayed on funerary monuments for both pagan and Christian craftsmen. Pagan—and Jewish—formulae lived on in Christian funerary vocabulary. Here are some examples datable to the third to ninth centuries: *hyper euchēs*, “in completion of the vow”; *oudis* [*sic*] *athanatos*, “nobody is immortal”; *non fuimus et fuimus*, “we were not and we came into being”; *cheireete* or *cheireste* [*sic*] *xeny* [*sic*] *kai parodite* [*sic*], “greetings, strangers and passers-by”; *zōmen en theō*, “let us live in God”; *vibas* or *biba[t]* [*sic*] *in deo*, “may you (or he) live in God (or the Lord)”; *pax tibi* or *eirēnē soi*, both meaning “peace be to you.”⁷ Some longer epigraphical formulae employed both East and West were also holdovers from pagan times; these include statements about penalties to be exacted from eventual violators

of the grave (the penalties were to go to the treasury or to the Church, depending on the faith of the deceased). Regardless of the place of their provenance, important early inscriptions contain the same covertly Christian—or syncretistic—traits. Such is the case of the queen of all the early Christian inscriptions, the Aberkios poem from Hierapolis in Asia Minor, and the Pektorios inscription from Autun (the ancient Augustodunum) in France, both monuments dating from the third century.⁸

The bilingual milieu of early Christian Rome produced bilingual inscriptions in the city's cemeteries. A distant parallel is offered by a fourth-century epitaph from another imperial capital, Trier in northwest Germany; in it, the deceased "Oriental's" (he is called *anatolikos* in the inscription) approximate age was given twice, once in Greek and once in Latin. In the Greek part of the epitaph, the formula *mikrō pliō* [*sic*], "somewhat more," that is, "more or less" was used; this was a "Westernism," corresponding to the frequent *plus minus*, "more or less," on sixth-century Latin inscriptions from Italy (the Greek *plio* [*sic*] *elatton*, "more or less" also occurred in fifth-century Syracuse).⁹

Sometimes it is difficult to say what the stonecutter's or glazier's mother tongue may have been. Consider the *vivas pie zēsēs* formula:¹⁰ is its *pie* the Latin adverb "piously," or the Greek imperative "drink"? Or consider a late third-century inscription from Rome, with its hybrid spelling *ann* (in Latin letters) followed by *ōroum* (in Greek letters), resulting in one word meaning "years" in Latin, followed by the Roman numeral X for "ten" and by the horror *mēsōroum* (in Greek letters) to represent *mensium*, "months" in Latin, followed by the word *septem*, "seven," in the same language.¹¹

Even when inscriptions were executed in separate languages, they were cast into the same poetic molds. The hexameter was such a preponderant mold. It was Virgilian in inspiration in the Latin West (and occasionally even in Constantinople, as long as Latin remained one of the official languages there); Homeric and, after the fifth century, Nonnian, in the East. This uniformity in the matter of literary forms gives one the sense of the vastness and cultural unity of the Empire even as late as the year 600 or so. The famous Byzantine general Comentiolus spoke of fortifications and buildings he had erected in the Spanish Cartagena in Virgilian and Ovidian hexameters in an inscription he dated to the reign of the Byzantine emperor Maurice (d. 602); earlier in the sixth century, Solomon, a general who reconquered Africa from the Vandals, spoke in his own, if worse, hexameters of similar fortifications he had erected on that continent.¹²

Several epigraphical formulae continued to be used both East and West up to the eighth century. These include the formula threatening the transgressor with the curse of the 318 Fathers assembled at the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea. This formula, routine in the East, is also found both in fifth-century Rome and in eighth-century Ravenna. Excerpts from the *Credo* occur on Greek and Latin inscriptions, with examples coming from Corinth (Justinian's time) and Italy respectively.¹³ Door lintels, not only from Syria and Palestine, but

also from Africa, display similar apotropaic quotations, culled from the Scriptures (especially the Psalms) and from liturgy. Even the Semitic formula *heis theos*, “God is One,” may have its counterpart in the Latin epigraphical expression *unum deum crededit* [sic], “he believed in One God.”

We know from Palestine of the habit of donors—often Jewish—to state in inscriptions how many feet of a mosaic floor had been laid out owing to their generous contributions. The same practice is attested for the fifth- to sixth-century Veneto or Lucca: *fecit pedes XXVII*, “he had twenty-seven [square] feet made,” or, in a bilingual inscription, *fecerunt pedes C*, “they had a hundred [square] feet made.”¹⁴ The acronym *XMG*, *Christon Maria gennā*, “Mary gives birth to Christ,” is usually associated with Syria, where it occurs on many inscriptions. It is also, however, attested in other parts of the Empire; not only in Rome (on late fourth-century roof tiles in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore), but also in the Romanian coastal cities of Histria and Constanța (on sixth-century amphorae, although these amphorae may have been an import from the East). And Tropaeum Traiani in modern Romania offers a late (fifth–sixth century) example of a bilingual inscription that repeats the same message twice: + *stauros thanatou kai anastaseōs* + *crux mortis et resurrectionis*, “the cross, [symbol] of death and resurrection.”¹⁵ We shall close this sample of closely related formulae with three more random examples, coming from West and East respectively. As late as the seventh century, a sarcophagus from Rovigo (Veneto) displayed the liturgical formula for the repose of the deceased’s soul, *repausa e(a)m in seno Abraam et Isac et Gacob*, “put her (i.e., the soul) to rest in the bosom of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob.” The same liturgical formula enjoyed great popularity on funerary inscriptions both Coptic and Greek, in the Egyptian Coptic realm and in Christian Nubia. The cryptic use of two letters *koppa* and *theta* with the numeric value of 99 (90 + 9) to express the word *amēn*, the combined numeric value of whose letters is 99 as well (a = 1; m = 40; ē = 8; n = 50) was widespread in the Semitic realm, Egypt, and Nubia; but we also find it on a column of the Parthenon in Athens, where it stands at the end of an (eighth- or ninth-century?) inscription.¹⁶ And the ubiquitous *phōs zōē*, “light, life” formula is attested, to quote sixth-century examples alone, in an area extending from Antioch on the Orontes (today’s Turkey) to Palestine and to the Romanian Constanța.¹⁷

III

When do we begin to notice the parting of the ways of the respective epigraphies of the East and the West? For parts of Italy, the beginnings of this process overlap with the late years of Byzantine domination (roughly speaking, the middle of the eighth century). By that time, the Latin functional counterpart to the Greek formula *enthade katakeitai*, “here lies,” is often no longer *hic positus est* or *hic iacet*, “here has been deposited” or “here lies,” but the by now familiar *hic requiescit in pace*, “here rests in peace.”¹⁸ A good example of this

kind of divergence is the floor mosaic of the Church of St. Francis in Ravenna (the building predating the saint), where the traditional Greek *mnēsthēti Kyrie*, “remember, O Lord,” located in one part of the mosaic in the fifth to sixth century is paralleled by the Latin *iste locus sancti complectitur [ossa Neonis]*, “this place contains the bones of Saint Neon,” inserted in the ninth century in another. By the fifth to sixth century, Latin inscriptions from Italy are often dated by the year of a Western consul, not that of the Byzantine emperor.¹⁹

Clear signs of a drifting apart of East and West, however, date from the eighth century and can be juxtaposed with the effects of two seventh- and eighth-century events, one cataclysmic, one more local: the Arab invasions and the establishment of the Lombards in their kingdom and principalities in Italy.

For the Arabs, two cases will stand for the others. The eighth-century inscription of Bishop Arcadius stated that he had come to Italy (Chiusi) from Spain *veniens ab Hispaniis Ismaelitar(um) clade sublatus*, “swept away by the calamity [brought about by] the Ishmaelites.” The melancholy content of Arcadius’s inscription is vastly different from the self-assured tone of the inscription in the city walls of Nicaea in Asia Minor that celebrated “putting the enemies’ insolence to shame” and the successful defense of that city from the Arab attack in 727.²⁰ The two societies, facing the same Islamic danger that was coming from the West and from the East respectively, fared differently and turned their backs upon each other.

The Lombard conquerors, their kings and dignitaries, continued to use the hexameter in inscriptions they commissioned, but they introduced a new element—pride in the commissioner’s noble origin. In Pavia in about 700 one *dux* Audoald boasted in rhythmical lines that hardly deserve to be called hexameters that he was *claris natalibus ortus*, “issued from famous ancestors,” and King Cunincpert let it be known that he was the grandson of a king and the son of a queen.²¹ In Byzantium, putting such a premium on genealogy came about two centuries later, and was reflected in epigraphy at an even later date.

As the Byzantine point of chronological reference was no longer obligatory for the Lombards, they dated their inscriptions by their own kings, while dating in Byzantine Ravenna continued to be done by the regnal years of Byzantine emperors. Moreover, a Beneventan inscription of 796 counted the years *ab incarnatione Domini*, “from the incarnation of the Lord,”²² a formula that was recent at the time, but that subsequently was to acquire the monopoly in the West (a monopoly only briefly interrupted by the French Revolution, Napoleon, and Benito Mussolini), and not by the years of an emperor’s reign. True, the latter type of dating fades away in “Eastern” Byzantine inscriptions as well. From about the same time—the eighth century—come the graffiti of the Parthenon in Athens, in which counting from the creation of the world is first epigraphically attested in the form of the “Byzantine era.”²³ Both West and East introduced new ways of dating inscriptions, but they replaced the old common system by two divergent ones. (The dating by the Christian era

appeared in Byzantium proper only in the last years of its existence, and was the result of Western influence.)

A mosaic floor from Ivrea in Northern Italy, dating from the tenth century, depicts five ladies, *gramatica*, *philosophia* [sic], *dialectica*, *geometria*, *arimetica*; one of them, the *dialectica*, points to an inscription that I read as *tr(i)v(i)u(m)*, that is, the course of instruction in three disciplines. I do not recall any Byzantine inscribed representation of personified subjects of the trivium and quadrivium. Byzantium was aware of this educational system by the ninth century, but it formally discussed it only in the thirteenth.²⁴ A similar observation can be made about the heirs to the hexameter that in the earlier centuries predominated in poetic inscriptions East and West: by about the year 1000 in Western inscriptions, hexameters were being transformed into rhymed entities, to end up as *versus Leonini*; in Byzantine ones, they were yielding to dodecasyllables which had played a less prominent role in earlier centuries (although, true, they had been used in seventh-century Ravenna).

In short, one senses that by the tenth century the two worlds were dealing with their own inscriptions in their own ways.

IV

In presenting the model of initial unity and subsequent divergence in the world of Eastern and Western inscriptions, I have given short shrift to differences between the two epigraphies that had existed from the early times on. I shall select only one case in point here: it has to do with the differential treatment of vernacular languages, and therefore of vernacular epigraphy, East and West respectively. In the Western part of the European continent at least, where Latin was the only language with a developed written past and where the Latin Church ran a tight *navicula Sancti Petri*, vernacular epigraphy used Latin letters only (if we except the rare Southern Runic inscriptions) and was a late bloomer. French inscriptions begin in about the year 1200, the German ones (if we disregard the *rarissima* of the tenth century), in the thirteenth century.

The situation was different in the Byzantine cultural sphere, with its greater permissiveness, even if the latter existed more in fact than in intention. It is understandable that languages with a tradition, such as Coptic, heir to the Egyptian, and Syriac, heir to the Aramaic, should have created their own epigraphies (with borrowed or indigenous alphabets) at their early Christian beginnings, and even that Semitic speakers of Syria should have developed a particular sequence (from right to left) for writing numbers in their own Greek epigraphy.²⁵ It is more noteworthy that the Turkic Bulgarians composed inscriptions not only in Greek, but also in their own language (true, in Greek letters) even before 864, the date of their baptism; that a special alphabet for the Slavs (both those baptized and those still to be baptized), the Glagolitic, was developed by the Byzantines as early as the 860s and left epigraphic monuments; and that Southern and Eastern Slavs (the former relative, the latter

genuine, newcomers to Mediterranean culture), should have developed their vernacular epigraphies no later than a mere half a century or so after their respective Christianizations. The earliest dated Bulgarian inscription (in Slavic and in the Cyrillic alphabet) thus comes from the second decade of the tenth century, while the earliest securely dated East Slavic graffito in Slavic was written in 1052.²⁶ Undated, if tantalizing, testimony must be left out of the present broad outline: the one-word Cyrillic graffito on a vessel from Eastern Slavic territory, the earliest Novgorodian documents on birch bark (if they can be called epigraphic), and the two or three surviving Orthodox Christian inscriptions in Alan language and in Greek letters, coming from the North Caucasus (they seem to date from the twelfth century, while the Alans were Christianized in the tenth).

V

A Byzantinist attempting to undertake a comparative study of inscriptions East and West will soon make a melancholy discovery. Information presented about the period beyond that covered by manuals of early Christian epigraphy that he derives from synthetic treatments of Medieval Latin epigraphy by such authors as Rudolf M. Kloos (1980), Robert Favreau (1974 and 1989), Walter Koch, Iiro Kajanto, and Pierre Petitmengin and his team (1989), quickly makes it evident how much farther ahead his Western colleagues have progressed compared to his fellow Byzantinists. This realization seems to be true with respect to teamwork, institutional underpinnings, planning, or publication of corpora. Although they might find some solace in the smaller size of the corpus of their epigraphical evidence compared to the late antique and medieval materials available to their Latinist colleagues, Byzantine epigraphists still have their work cut out for them.

NOTES

The following works will be adduced in an abbreviated form in the body of this article: Kaufmann = Carl Maria Kaufmann, *Handbuch der altchristlichen Epigraphik* (Freiburg in Breisgau, 1917), quoted by page and figure (this remains a reliable workhorse); Diehl = Ernestus Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae veteres*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1961–1967), quoted by inscription number; Rugo = Pietro Rugo, *Le iscrizioni dei sec. VI–VII–VIII esistenti in Italia*, 5 vols. (Cittadella, 1974–1980), quoted by volume and inscription number; Popescu = Emilian Popescu, *Inscripțiile grecești și latine din secolele IV–XIII descoperite în România* (Bucharest, 1976), quoted by inscription number; Guillou = André Guillou, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques médiévales d'Italie* (Rome, 1996), quoted by inscription number.

1. Of central importance to our subject is Guglielmo Cavallo and Cyril Mango, eds., *Epigrafia medievale greca e latina: ideologia e funzione. Atti del Seminario di Erice, 12–18 settembre 1991* (Spoleto, 1995).
2. See Popescu, no. 28; also Anna Avramea, “Mort loin de la patrie . . .” in *Epigrafia*, ed. Cavallo and Mango, p. 17 and Catalogue no. 46 (p. 24). Avramea’s Catalogue of 420 early inscriptions commemorating people deceased far from their native places eloquently illustrates our point.
3. For example, Diehl, no. 2300 A, which reads in part: *koiougi benignissime [koue] bixit in pake annis biginti et zex* in Greek letters, but in Latin, meaning “to the most kind wife that lived in peace twenty-six years.”
4. For *visomus*, see Kaufmann, p. 127.
5. Rugo 5, no. 20, and Guillou, no. 106, with the words *agēōs [s(anc)]tou[s a]mbrosēous papa aikk(aisi)ai maidē[o]lanensēs* = deformed Greek *hagios*, “saint,” repeated in Latin as *s(anc)tu[s a]mbrosius, papa eccl(esi)ae mediolanensis* (Saint, Saint Ambrose, pope of the Church of Milan); Rugo 5, no. 34a, and Guillou, no. 107, *agēous Nazarēus o arnoious o Th(eo)u* = deformed Greek *hagios*, “saint,” followed by the name of Nazarius (with a Latin *-us* ending); + *o* = article + the deformed *arnion* = lamb (a calque after the Latin *agnus*) + *o* (article in a wrong case) + the correct Greek abbreviation for “God” (Saint Nazarius, lamb of God); Rugo 5, no. 34b (similar deformed Greek with Latin *-us* endings).
6. See Kaufmann, p. 44 and fig. 37 (a. 269); note *mēsōrōn* = *mensium*, “months,” and *deorōn* = *dierum*, “days.”
7. For “nobody is immortal,” see, for example, Kaufmann, pp. 166 and 297. For examples coming from East and West of the formula *non fuimus et fuimus*, “we were not and we came into being,” and its Greek Pagan and

Christian counterparts *ouk ēmēn, egenomēn, ouk eimi*, “I was not, I came into being, I am no longer,” see Kaufmann, p. 134, and Franz Cumont, “Non fui, fui, non sum,” *Musée belge* 32 (1928): 73–85 (20 inscriptions); see also Angelo Brelich, *Aspetti della morte nelle iscrizioni sepolcrali dell’ Impero Romano* (Budapest, 1937) [= *Dissertationes Pannonicae Musei Nationalis Hungarici*, ser. 1, fasc. 7], esp. pp. 58–60. An echo of the formula is heard in the Christianized formulation of the Slavic *Vita* of Cyril-Constantine, Apostle of the Slavs, ch. 18:4, where the Saint says towards the end of his life: “I was not and I came to be and I am for ever, Amen.” For *xeny kai parodite*, see, for example, Rugo 2, no. 32 (fig. only, p. 110), and Guillou, no. 60. For *zōmen en theō*, see Kaufmann, p. 141, fig. 138; for *vibas [sic] in deo* and similar formulae, see Kaufmann, p. 141, fig. 149 (3rd c.); Rugo 4, no. 21 (9th c.? Monte S. Angelo); no. 23 (same date and place); no. 64 (7th c., Lucera). For *pax tibi, eirēne soi, in pace, pax, eirēnē*, see Diehl, nos. 2297 G-L; 2298–2300 A.

8. For the famous Aberkios’s inscription in hexameters, see, for example, Kaufmann, p. 171. For Pektorios’s poetic inscription, see *ibid.*, p. 179.
9. For the Ursicinus inscription from Trier, see Kaufmann, p. 91; for the one from Syracuse, see *ibid.*, p. 196. For the Latin *plus minus* or *menus*, see, for example, Rugo 1, no. 24 (a. 540, Mantua?), no. 46 (a. 525, Brescia); Rugo 4, nos. 28 (a. 503, Venosa), 61 (7th c., Benevento), 72a (a. 541, Cimitile), 77 (a. 557, Cimitile), 90 (5th c., Cimitile), 91 (a. 535, Cimitile), 96 (a. 527, Capua), 105 (5th c., S. Angelo in Formis); Rugo 5, nos. 22 (a. 523, Milan), 79 (5th c., Como), 105 (a. 539, Pavia), 151 (a. 545, Ivrea), 157 (6th c., Vercelli), 168 (a. 527, La Spezia).
10. For examples, see Diehl, nos. 866 B, 866 D, 872 AB, 873, 873 A, 874, 875 A. Also cf. 2289 with 2290.
11. See Kaufmann, p. 140 and fig. 137 (third century).
12. For Comentiolus, see Diehl, no. 792; for Solomon, see *ibid.*, no. 791.
13. The 318 Fathers of Nicea: for Syria and Rome, see Kaufmann, pp. 157–58; for Ravenna, see Rugo 3, no. 9 (a. 731); for a twelfth-century echo of the 318 Fathers’ curse formula, see, for example, Guillou, no. 104. The Credo: for Corinth, see Kaufmann, p. 144; for Capua and Como, see *ibid.*, p. 208.
14. See Rugo 2, nos. 18–19 (Iesolo), 47, 47a-b, 49 (Grado); Rugo 3, no. 79 (Florence).
15. For Syria, see, for example, Kaufmann, pp. 413–15, figs. 239–43, and Henri Seyrig in Georges Tchalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du Nord*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1958) [= *Bibliothèque archéologique et historique*, 50], no. 39b, p. 37 (fourth–fifth century?). For roof tiles of Santa Maria Maggiore, see Kaufmann, p. 425 and Fig. 246; for amphorae, see

- Popescu, nos. 139, 140, 187 and 316–24; for the Tropaeum Traiani inscription, see Popescu, no. 173.
16. Liturgical formula from Rovigo: Rugo 2, no. 37; for Egypt, see, for example, Gustave Lefebvre, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes, d'Égypte* (Cairo, 1907), nos. 647, 652, 659, 660; for the same formula in Christian Nubia, see, for example, Jadwiga Kubińska, *Inscriptions grecques chrétiennes* (Warsaw, 1974) [=Faras 4], no. 3, p. 24 (a. 765), no. 5, p. 32 (a. 923) and a number of other inscriptions in the volume. For *amēn* = 99, see, in general, Kaufmann, pp. 75, 143, and, for example, Lefebvre, *Recueil*, no. 659 (but the provenance may be Nubia); Kubińska, *Inscriptions*, no. 1, p. 15 (a. 707); for 99 in the more “Western” Parthenon, see Anastasios K. Orlandos and Leandros Vranoussis, *Les graffiti du Parthénon* (Athens, 1973), no. 141, pp. 113–14. As to the meaning of 99, while the editors were not sure whether the number 99 stood for the *date* of the graffito, they speculated that it may have referred to the *age* of the deceased mentioned in it.
 17. See Kaufmann, p. 415 and Fig. 243 (Syria); Rugo 5, no. 18 (Caesarea maritima in Palestine); Popescu, no. 49 (Constanța?).
 18. For the *hic positus est, hic situs*, etc., see Kaufmann, pp. 108 and 110. For the many fifth- to sixth-century examples of *requiesc. in pace*, see, for example, Rugo 1, no. 18 (Osoppo), no. 46 (Brescia), no. 57 (Bergamo); Rugo 4, no. 92 (Avello); Rugo 5, no. 149 (Tortona); cf. *ibid.*, no. 151, 155, 156 (Ivrea).
 19. For the two inscriptions in the Church of St. Francis in Ravenna, see Rugo 3, nos. 20 and 21. For dating by Western consuls, see, for example, Rugo 1, no. 18 (a. 524); 4, no. 109 (a. 541, Benevento); 5, no. 108 (a. 539, Pavia), 151 (a. 545, Ivrea), 168 (a. 527, La Spezia). The situation is quite complicated and excellently presented by Jean Durliat, “Épigraphie et société” in Cavallo and Mango, *Epigrafia*, pp. 172–73 (tables).
 20. For Bishop Arcadius, see Rugo 3, no. 95 (where Rugo’s text is erroneous); for the inscription in the walls of Nicaea, see, for example, Alfons M. Schneider and Walter Karnapp, *Die Stadtmauer von Iznik (Nicaea)* (Berlin, 1938), p. 49 (inscription no. 29) and Plate 50; see also Clive Foss, *Nicaea: A Byzantine Capital and Its Praises: With the Speeches of Theodore Laskaris in Praise of the Great City of Nicaea, and Theodore Metochites’ Nicene Oration* (Brookline, MA, 1996), p. 18. The Greek phrase crucial for us is *to tōn echthrōn kataischynthē [sic] thrasos*.
 21. For Audoald, see Rugo 5, no. 107 (ca. 718, Pavia); for Cunincpert, see *ibid.*, no. 113 (a. 700, Pavia).
 22. Dating by Lombard kings: for example, Rugo 4, no. 8 (Spoleto, a. 770); Rugo 5, no. 160 (a. 691, Turin). Dating by Byzantine emperors in the Exarchate by Ravenna: Rugo 4, no. 51 (a. 796, Benevento). The *Anno*

- Domini* date of 814 in the inscription (authentic or not) on the tomb of Charlemagne reported in Eginhard's *Vita* does not belong here, since the Christian era (established in the sixth century) was adopted by Western chroniclers such as Bede (d. 735) soon after its creation.
23. See Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Les graffiti*, nos. 34 (a. 693, doubtful), 80 (a. 704), 82 (a. 779), 126 (a. 793).
 24. For the floor mosaic from Ivrea, see Rugo 5, no. 150; for the ninth-century Byzantine awareness of the seven liberal arts (*trivium* and *quadrivium*) system, see, for example, Ignatios the Deacon, *Vita Nicephori*, in *Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opuscula*, ed. Carl De Boor (Leipzig, 1880), p. 149, line 27 to p. 151, line 13; and the Slavic *Vita* of Constantine-Cyril, IV, 1–3. For the full Byzantine discussion of the system ca. 1300, see George Pachymeres, *Quadrivium de Georges Pachymère*, ed. Paul Tannery and E. Stéphanou (Vatican City, 1940) [=Studi e Testi, 94], especially the Preface by V. Laurent, pp. vii–xxxiii.
 25. Thus, for example, “*ēta*, *ny*, *omega*” year = the year $8 + 50 + 800 = 858$. The Medieval Slavic sequence in writing numerals, for example, *bi* = $2 + 10 = 12$, is independent from the Semitic one, and has its parallels in the right-to-left sequence of numerals found in native Greek inscriptions from Macedonia.
 26. For the Bulgarian inscription from Krepcha, dated to 921, see, for example, Kazimir Popkonstantinov, “Novootkriti starobŭlgarski nadpisi ot X vek,” in *Paléographie et diplomatique slaves*, ed. Borjana Velčeva et al. (Sofia, 1980) [=Balcanica, ser. 3, Études et documents, 1], esp. p. 289 and Figs. 1–2. The inscription of the Bulgarian “inner Boyar” Mostič (discovered in 1952) dates from the middle of the tenth century. See, for example, St. Stančev et al., *Nadpisŭt na čŭrgubilja Mostič* (Sofia, 1955), esp. p. 8. For the graffito of 1052 from Saint Sophia in Kyiv, see, for example, Sergej Vysotskij, *Drevnerusskie nadpisi Sofii Kievskoj, XI–XIV vv.*, fasc. 1 (Kyiv, 1966), no. 3, pp. 16–17; see also idem, *Srednevekovye nadpisi Sofii Kievskoj* (Kyiv, 1976), pp. 198–201, for speculations about a graffito that the author dates to 1031–1032.